

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.			BO-98DIV	4889
10/066,084	01/31/2002	Wolfgang Streubel		
7	590 02/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Friedrich Kue	3,0		KASTLER, SCOTT R	
317 Madison Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 910			1742	

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$
II.	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	10/066,084	STREUBEL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott Kastler	1742
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Decay 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 10-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 10-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2002 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. r election requirement. er. : a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Application in the second	ion No. <u>09/406,333</u> . ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		· (DTO 442)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 10/066,084

Art Unit: 1742

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowalski et al in view of Umemoto et al and the ASM Handbook, Vol. 4. Kowalski et al teaches a system for manufacturing elongate structural parts (22) including a means for shaping a steel blank into the elongate structural part (40), an induction element (52) and downstream cooling unit (54) adapted to surround the formed part, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except the positioning of the induction heating and cooling elements on a tool carriage for movement vertically while treating the vertically positioned part, means for positioning the elongate part vertically for heat treatment, or the adjustable positioning of the cooling element relative to the induction element. Umemoto et al teaches that when heat treating general elongate members (1), it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to vertically arrange the member to be treated and then conduct a heat treatment employing an inductor element (3) and following positionable multiple cooling elements (4) mounted on a tool carriage (33), and that this arrangement affords improved heat treating results (see col. 1 lines 45-57 for example). The ASM Handbook, Vol. 4 teaches that it was also known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ workhandling equipment enabling the vertical positioning of structural members to be heat treated by induction heating means (see page 183 under "Workhandling Equipment"), as well as also teaching that structural members (see page 196 under "Through-Hardening

Application/Control Number: 10/066,084

Art Unit: 1742

Applications") were known at the time the invention was made to be inductively hardened in a vertical orientation with an induction coil and following separate multiple cooling element quench ring (see page 195, quench system (f) used for through hardening, which as explained above is applicable to structural elements of the type described by Kowalski et al). Because improved heat treating quality would also be desirable in the system described by Kowalski et al, and vertical induction heat treatment was known in the art at the time the invention was made as being appropriate for elongate structural members, as taught by the ASM Handbook, Vol. 4; motivation to include both a vertical induction heat treating system, as taught by Umemoto et al, as well as a vertical positioning means to position the workpiece to be heat treated vertically, taught to be known in the art at the time the invention was made by the ASM Handbook Vol.4, to heat treat the elongate structural member of Kowalski et al, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the tie the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-6, filed on 12-19-2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims on these grounds has been withdrawn. In view of applicant's arguments it is agreed that the term "means for shaping" means any commonly known shaping means, such as presses or rollers, and "means for positioning" means any device capable of positioning a part in a vertical orientation.

Applicant's arguments filed on 12-19-2003 with respect to the art rejection of claims 10-12 however, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that Application/Control Number: 10/066,084

Art Unit: 1742

the instantly applied references do not teach a system capable of treating parts with a variable cross section is not persuasive because firstly, this limitation does not appear, either expressly of inherently in the instant claims; and secondly, at best this limitation is a limitation dealing with the manner or method in which the claimed apparatus is intended to be employed (use of the claimed apparatus to treat a specifically shaped workpiece). It has been well settled that the manner or method of use of an apparatus cannot be relied upon to fairly further distinguish claims to the apparatus itself. see MPEP 2114 and *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Kastler Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742